UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,034	09/22/2003	James D. Ralph	SPINE 3.0-441 CONT 1511 CONT	
51640 SPINE MP	7590 07/19/201	1	EXAM	IINER
LERNER, DAV			NELSON, CHRISTINE L	
600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST WESTFIELD, NJ 07090			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3775	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/19/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/667,034	RALPH ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	CHRISTINE NELSON	3775		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>31 Mar</u> 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1,2,4,6,7,9,10,13,18,19,21 and 24-26 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 18, 19, 21, and 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration. 1.24-26 is/are rejected.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) \[\sum \] Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary	(PTO-413)		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate		

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on May 31, 2011 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 18, 19, 21, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fraser et al. (US 6,592,624) in view of Hamada (US Patent 6,425,920).

Regarding Claims 1, 4, 9, and 19, Fraser et al. discloses an intervertebral spacer (Figure 1) that is porous (Column 5, lines 55-56) with a beveled edge (see Figures 1 and 2), an upper portion including an upper surface (Figure 2, 42) and a lower portion including a lower surface (Figure 2, 46) where the upper and lower surfaces are

Art Unit: 3775

displaced from each other a maximum distance along a first axis. Fraser further discloses a central trunk separating the upper and lower portions (16) where an upper relative angle designation mark (Figure 4, 20) is formed on the upper portion and a lower relative angle designation mark (Figure 4, 21) is formed on the lower portion, the upper and lower relative angle designation marks being separated by the central trunk and formed along the first axis so that the upper and lower relative angle designation marks are visible when the spacer is attached to an insertion tool. Please note: it appears that the relative angle designation marks would still be visible with a tool engaged; however, the tool is not positively recited, so it would depend upon the tool being used. Fraser et al. does not show or specify a specific tool for insertion, and the implant may be inserted in multiple directions (Column 7, lines 3-6). Fraser teaches an upper radial flange (Figure 4, 54) disposed between the upper surface and the annular groove, and a lower radial flange (56) disposed between the lower surface and the annular groove.

Fraser fails to disclose a central bore formed through the upper and lower surfaces, at least one of the upper and lower surfaces having a center that is substantially flat, the central bore formed through at least a portion of the center. However, Hamada teaches a spacer body central bore (707) passing through the upper (703) and lower (705) surfaces where both of the surfaces are substantially flat, and the upper and lower surfaces diametrically tapered (as seen in Figure 60). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the invention of Fraser with the central bore as taught by Hamada in order to

provide an area for osteogenic materials to be placed to provide for improved ingrowth and stability of the implant once placed.

Regarding Claims 2, 7, and 10, Fraser discloses the upper and lower surfaces of the spacer body diametrically tapered (Figure 7).

Regarding Claims 6 and 13, Fraser discloses the annular groove as tapered (Figure 6).

Regarding Claims 18 and 21, Fraser discloses the relative angle designation marks extending form a wall of the annular groove to either the upper or lower surface (Figure 6).

Regarding Claims 24-26, Fraser discloses that the upper and lower relative angle designation marks are grooves (Figures 5 and 6).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 18, 19, 21, and 24-26 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTINE L. NELSON whose telephone number is (571)270-5368. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30-5:00, first Friday off.

Application/Control Number: 10/667,034 Page 5

Art Unit: 3775

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, *please contact*

the examiner's supervisor, SPE, at (571) 272-4746. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

If there are any inquiries that are not being addressed by first contacting

the Examiner or the Supervisor, you may send an email inquiry to

TC3700_Workgroup_D_Inquiries@uspto.gov.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CHRISTINE L. NELSON/ Examiner, Art Unit 3775 /Thomas C. Barrett/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3775